

|   |                                      |                                    |  |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/004,463 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>MOON ET AL. |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b><br>Allan W Olsen     | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1763            |  |

**All Participants:**

(1) Allan W Olsen.

(2) Indranil Mukerji.

**Status of Application:** allowed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 2 February 2004

**Time:** 15:30 EST

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

*1-3 and nonexistant claims 24-29*

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called to clarify exactly what claims were pending in this Application, because the Notice of Allowance, mailed 10/15/2003, indicated that the allowed claims included claims 24-29, but no such claims could be found in the application. Mr. Mukerji indicated claims 1-3, as amended by a preliminary amendment, were the only claims pending in the application. Therefore, the previous reference to claims 24-29 was clearly erroneous.